

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

ROBERT BOECKMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-10-0595-HE
)	
TANDEM ENERGY HOLDINGS, INC.,)	
ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ROBERT BOECKMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-10-0596-HE
)	
TANDEM ENERGY HOLDINGS, INC.,)	
ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ROBERT BOECKMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-10-0597-HE
)	
ARROWHEAD OPERATING, INC.,)	
ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ROBERT BOECKMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-10-0598-HE
)	
TANDEM ENERGY HOLDINGS, INC.,)	
ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ROBERT BOECKMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-10-0599-HE
)	
TANDEM ENERGY HOLDINGS, INC.,)	
ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

On March 8, 2011, the court entered its order directing plaintiff to show cause within 14 days why these cases should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Plaintiff has not responded to the order.


A court may, in the exercise of sound discretion, dismiss a cause of action for want of prosecution. Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962); Joplin v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co., 671 F.2d 1274, 1275 (10th Cir. 1982); Petty v. Manpower, 591 F.2d 615, 617 (10th Cir. 1979). “In exercising this power, the [c]ourt has the authority to enforce its orders with a view to promptly processing and adjudicating its lawsuits.” Roberts v. McCroy, 693 F. Supp. 998, 1009 (W.D. Okla. 1987) (citing Stanley v. Continental Oil Co.,

536 F.2d 914 (10th Cir. 1976)).

Here, plaintiff has not offered any justification for his failure to pursue these cases and none is otherwise apparent. The captioned cases are therefore **DISMISSED** without prejudice to their refiling.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 29th day of March, 2011.



JOE HEATON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE